



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,894	•	07/10/2001	Ching-Chiang Yu	MR1115-330	5836
4586	759	00 04/22/2004		EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101				WONG, ALBERT KANG	
		Y, MD 21043	VE-SUITE IUI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2635	<u> </u>
,				DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/900,894	YU, CHING-CHIANG					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Albert K Wong	2635					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address					
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faill Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOn insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per irre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of the statutory minim	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02	2 February 2004.						
·	•	his action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the m								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims	·						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.						
Applicat	ion Papers	•						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.						
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are:	a) accepted or b) ⊠ obje	ected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con The oath or declaration is objected to by the			•				
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage	,				
Attachmer	it(s)							
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/900,894

Art Unit: 2635

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed February 2, 2004. Claims 11-20 are pending. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled. The prior rejections have been withdrawn because the claims have been cancelled.

- 2. Claims 12 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims should recite the additional elements as "further comprising" the keyboard. Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Messingschlager.

Regarding claim 1, the computer keyboard and scroll ball mounted contiguous to the space bar is shown Figure 1.

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messingschlager in view of Danzinger.

Regarding claim 12, Messingschlager teaches buttons adjacent the scroll ball. Although these buttons may be considered function keys, it is not clear is they are. Danzinger teaches in

Application/Control Number: 09/900,894

Art Unit: 2635

Figure 4a a scroll ball surrounded by function keys. One of ordinary skill in the art would be aware of both references since they both pertain to scroll balls located in keyboards. It would have been obvious to include functions keys around a scroll ball to provide convenient access to the desired function as suggested by Danzinger.

Regarding claim 13, the keys in Danzinger are cursor direction control keys.

Regarding claims 14-18, the assignment of a particular function to a particular key is considered an obvious design choice since there are various layouts of keyboards. It is generally known that similar function are more efficiently used if they are grouped together.

Regarding claim 19, it is conventional to mount displays to display the status of electronic device. Personal digital assistants use displays for status. Keyboards have LEDs to show status. It would have been obvious to use an LCD because an LCD requires less power to operate and provides a more flexible display. See Hunter reference.

- 7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification fails to teach how to make the claimed finger print identification device. While applicant has cited a patent that teaches a finger print identifier, he has not shown that at the time of filing he had an

Application/Control Number: 09/900,894

Art Unit: 2635

如何

understanding of how to make or use such a device. This is especially true since the Patent was published after the filing of the instant application.

9. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed fingerprint identification device must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2635

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert K Wong whose telephone number is 703-305-8884. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 703-305-4704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Albert K. Wong April 16, 2004